1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (Boston)
3	No. 1:23-cv-10511-WGY
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al, Plaintiffs
7	Pidincilis
8	vs.
9	
10	JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORPORATION, et al, Defendants
11	Delendants
12	* * * * * *
13	
14	For Hearing Before: Judge William G. Young
15	ouage william o. loung
16	Status Conference
17	United States District Court
18	District of Massachusetts (Boston) One Courthouse Way
19	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 Monday, October 30, 2023
20	Monday, October 30, 2023
21	* * * * * *
22	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR
23	Official Court Reporter
24	United States District Court One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210
25	rhrbulldog@aol.com

```
APPEARANCES
 1
 2
 3
    EDWARD WILLIAM DUFFY, ESQ.
    ARIANNA MARKEL, ESQ.
 4
    AARON TEITELBAUM, ESQ.
       DOJ-Atr
 5
       450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 8000
       Washington, DC 20530
 6
       (202) 812-4723
       Email: Edward.duffy@usdoj.gov
 7
   and
    WILLIAM T. MATLACK, ESQ.
 8
       Attorney General's Office
       One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
       Boston, MA 02108
 9
       (617) 727-2200
10
       Email: William.matlack@mass.gov
       For Plaintiffs United States of America and
       The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
11
12
13
    RYAN SHORES, ESQ.
       Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP
       2112 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
14
       Washington, DC 20037
       (202) 974-1876
15
       Email: Rshores@cgsh.com
16
   and
    ELIZABETH M. WRIGHT, ESQ.
17
       Cooley LLP
       500 Boylston Street
       Boston, MA 02116-3736
18
       (617) 937-2349
19
       Email: Ewright@cooley.com
   and
20
    RACHEL MOSSMAN ZIEMINSKI, ESQ.
    MICHAEL MITCHELL, ESQ.
21
       Shearman & Sterling LLP
       2601 Olive Street, 17th Floor
       Dallas, TX 75201
22
       Email: Rachel.zieminski@shearman.com
23
       For Defendant JetBlue Airways Corporation
24
25
       (Continued.)
```

```
(Continued.)
 1
 2
 3
    JAY COHEN, ESQ.
    ANDREW C. FINCH, ESQ.
 4
       Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison
       1285 Avenue of the Americas
 5
       New York, NY 10019-6064
       (212) 373-3000
 6
       Email: Jaycohen@paulweiss.com
       For Defendant Spirit Airlines, Inc.
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
 1
           (Begins, 2:00 p.m.)
 2
 3
           THE CLERK: Now hearing Civil Matter 23-10511, the
     United States of America versus JetBlue, et al.
 4
 5
           THE COURT: I think for purpose of this -- yes,
 6
     come up. And as you're coming up, why don't you
     introduce yourself and who you represent, starting with
8
     the plaintiffs.
           MR. DUFFY: Yes, your Honor. Edward Duffy for the
 9
     United States on behalf of plaintiffs.
10
11
           MS. MARKEL: Arianna Markel, on behalf of the
12
     plaintiffs, for the United States.
13
           MR. TEITELBAUM: Aaron Teitelbaum for the
14
     plaintiffs as well.
15
           THE COURT: Good afternoon.
16
           MR. SHORES: Good afternoon, your Honor, Ryan
17
     Shores, with Cleary Gottlieb, on behalf of Defendant
     JetBlue.
18
19
           MR. COHEN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Jay Cohen
20
     for the defendant Spirit.
           THE COURT: Good afternoon.
21
           MS. WRIGHT: Elizabeth Wright, from Cooley LLC, on
22
23
     behalf of JetBlue.
           MS. ZIEMINSKI: Good morning, your Honor, Rachel
24
25
     Mossman Zieminski, from Shearman & Sterling, on behalf
```

of JetBlue.

MS. BANSAL: Good morning. Dee Bansal from Cooley LLC, on behalf of JetBlue.

MR. FINCH: Good afternoon, your Honor, Andrew Finch for Spirit Airlines.

MR. MITCHELL: Good afternoon, your Honor, Michael Mitchell, Shearman & Sterling, for JetBlue.

THE COURT: And please be seated. Thank you for attending on this session of the court.

I have a half an hour and I'll raise those things, they're just trial management points, but that I would find helpful. I don't think this is the time for argument, but I think we'll have some time for questions. Recognizing that I'm going to stop at 2:30.

First, because a number of state Attorneys General who are connected with the case have made calls asking can they participate by zoom and the like, it makes me think that I should order, and now I do --

Mr. Duffy, this case was commenced, on the part of the United States government, by the Department of Justice, so I look at you as lead counsel here, and your colleagues. And since we have time limits on this case, which I'm going to enforce, um, I'd like to know who's going to open, if anyone is going to speak in addition to you. As I do in every multi-party case, I take the

objection of one as the objection of all, and I take it that as between JetBlue and Spirit, you are joined in the position argued by one, um, without the necessity of two people arguing the position.

I also would be helped -- and I don't think it's a burden on you, any of the parties, that when we get to examining witnesses, it would be helpful to me if you -- and Mr. Duffy I look to you, if you give me a list of the attorneys who are going to examine a witness and the same thing for the defense. Whether it's cross-examination or direct examination, I like to call people by name, and I will get to know your names, and it will go more smoothly. So if you could indulge me in that fashion.

Second, I most recently got this, um, motion jointly for -- to allow, with Court Connect, the, um, transmission of these proceedings back to your law offices.

I will tell you, that motion is denied, and it's denied solely on this basis. It happens that I agree completely with the parties' request in this matter and I simply think it is beyond our court's rules, which do have the force of law, um, it's beyond what I can allow under the court's rules even with the most recent iteration through the Court Administration and Case

Management Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States. I just can't authorize this.

I'm going to make a suggestion. First of all, I would not authorize it in the breadth that you all seem to want, but I am perfectly amenable, in fact I think it makes good sense, that to authorize this motion, which would add no expense to the court administration of this case and would save the money of the litigants, certainly a desirable outcome, but I would have these limitations. It would only go to the law offices of those who are actually parties, and then only to the law offices, if you're in different law offices, where lawyers who have filed an appearance in this case for the parties in this case, um, actually reside, not experts, not other interested lawyers and the like.

And my suggestion is, if I got any sort of authorization from the Judicial Conference, from the Court Administration or the Case Management Committee, from their staffs, or the staff of the Administrative Office, that I could interpret the prohibition on broadcasting to cover the limited Court Connect proposal, I would allow it.

Other matters? Let's see. I have again perused the motions pending list and I can rule on a few more.

The motions in limine to exclude the anticipated

testimony by Sarah Nelson, 171, that's allowed.

The motion in limine to exclude testimony from Richard Scheff, that's denied, but I'm very skeptical of Mr. Scheff's, the foundation for his testimony, and we'll see when he goes to testify.

All the unopposed motions to seal are allowed and they are Motions 236, 243, 246, 248, 254, 256, 260, 261, 279 -- or that's a different motion, I'll speak to it.

And 294.

279 is a motion for leave to file a brief, amicus curiae, by the Transport Workers, and that motion is allowed and the brief is, um, accepted.

One other thing that would be helpful, and I'll stop, because I think we're all ready to go at 9:00 tomorrow morning. You have given me the packet of deposition excerpts. It is in every respect satisfactory and I appreciate your putting it together and I have begun to work with it. It would be helpful, and I recognize this is advocacy, but I don't shrink from the advocacy, if I had a list of the order in which you think, from your several positions, I ought be reading these depositions. I've just launched in with Mr. Beck -- I mean Mr. Beck because he is the top of the alphabet. (Laughter.) I mean him no disrespect, but I recognize that starting with him is starting in medias

res and, um, that would be helpful.

Now really that's everything -- oh, one other thing, and I should be on top of this, and this is a question addressed to JetBlue.

You have a motion here to, um, as to the testimony of one of the government's two experts on the ground --don't strike him entirely, but you say there's overlap there. If you would remind me of the -- of what motion that is, I would be helped.

MR. SHORES: Yes, your Honor. That is a motion to exclude in part the testimony of Dr. Chipty, who is one of the government's experts, and if the Court would like us to address that, we're happy to do so.

THE COURT: I'm sure you are.

(Laughter.)

THE COURT: I thought that was it. And, um, that motion is allowed with this proviso, or without prejudice. If having allowed that motion the government thinks that something's -- allowed it the way they framed it, any part of the substance of the government's expert presentation is -- now drops between the bar stools, I invite you to point that out to me how it is absent from the, um, testimony of the other expert. But not now.

MR. DUFFY: Okay.

1 (Laughter.)
2 MR. DUFFY:

MR. DUFFY: And just so I understand the Court's order, as I understand it, the Court is allowing that motion to the extent the testimony is in fact overlapping between Dr. Chipty and --

THE COURT: That was my intention. I have to rule on the particular proposal. I'm adopting theirs without prejudice to your pointing out particular experts -- particular excerpts, because I want the full testimony.

MR. DUFFY: All right, so at the time she testifies. Okay. Understood.

THE COURT: Yes, thank you.

Well that's really everything I had, and I'm prepared to recess unless there are questions that I can answer.

Questions on the part of the United States or -- yes, Mr. Duffy.

MR. DUFFY: Yes, I would just respond to the Court's question about, um, with respect to openings, that Mr. Matlack from the Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General will be giving a portion of the opening tomorrow, um, and in fact it will be Ms. Markel on behalf of the United States giving the primary portion of it.

THE COURT: And, Ms. Markel, you'll go first?

```
MS. MARKEL: Yes, your Honor.
 1
 2
           THE COURT: All right, openings by Ms. Markel and
 3
     Mr. Matlack. Fine.
           MR. SHORES: Yes, your Honor, Ryan Shores. I will
 4
     be giving part of the opening tomorrow and my colleague
 5
     from Spirit, Jay Cohen, will be giving part of the
 6
     opening tomorrow.
8
           THE COURT: And I appreciate it. Thank you both.
           MR. DUFFY: And we understand the Court's position
 9
     on the objection for one is an objection for all, that's
10
11
     certainly understood and appreciated by us.
12
           THE COURT: All right.
           MR. SHORES: Yes, and of course us as well, your
13
14
     Honor.
15
           One thing I would note is, for example, if a
16
     third-party is being examined, you know it may be done
17
     by a JetBlue counsel, but if Spirit's counsel has a
     unique issue, um, I would hope they would be able to
18
19
     object on that particular issue.
20
           THE COURT: Your refinement is something I should
21
     have said. Of course they can. I just want a record
22
     that separates that out.
23
           MR. SHORES: Of course, your Honor.
24
           THE COURT: Otherwise -- of course I want to
25
     preserve everyone's rights. Unless -- I think the way
```

```
to say it is, unless you say "Just on behalf of Spirit"
 1
     or "Just on behalf of JetBlue," we'll assume, for the
 2
 3
     purpose of my analysis and also review, that both
     JetBlue and Spirit have objected or made the argument
 4
 5
     that's made.
 6
           MR. SHORES: Yes, your Honor.
 7
           THE COURT: All right.
 8
           Anything else?
 9
           MR. DUFFY: I do have one final question I think,
10
     your Honor.
11
           With respect to the expert testimony, um, you know
12
     frequently in merger cases the plaintiffs will put on
13
     their rebuttal case in --
14
           THE COURT: Yes, I can see that in this case.
                                                            I'm
15
     not inviting it. But I can see it.
16
           MR. DUFFY: Okay, understood.
17
           MR. SHORES: May I address that, your Honor?
           THE COURT: Yes.
18
19
           MR. SHORES: I mean from the defendants'
20
     perspective, your Honor's questionnaire says it's rare.
21
     There have been multiple depositions in this case.
     You've already ruled nobody can speak to anything
22
23
     outside the report. So from our perspective there's
24
     nothing new under the sun here and there's no reason to
25
     have the experts come back on rebuttal in this
```

particular case.

THE COURT: Let me -- hearing that I may be opening a can of worms here, um, there's much to what you say and I want this case tried tight and persuasively. The government has a -- and I've read at least the trial briefs and various other things, but the government's got its theory both of market, which you disagree with, but also of violations of the, um, violations of the appropriate statutes. You rebut that and your rebuttal depends on various things to take place in the future.

I'm still troubled -- I'm not troubled, because I can understand it, but you'll recall what I've said about sealed matters -- and I've sealed everything that no one really objects to being sealed, and I can understand that, but if they put on a case which would, um, warrant, though not compel relief, you're going to have to go forward and say, "But our plans will obviate these concerns." I recognize I'm talking in a very high degree of generality.

I don't see myself deciding anything on the basis of a secret plan. I mean you're going to have to explain to me what the plans are that make it better if I were to allow this to go forward. And I can see them trying to rip up that. That's where my mind is.

```
MR. SHORES: Your Honor, if I may?
1
 2
           THE COURT: Yes.
 3
           MR. SHORES: There's no secrets here at all, um,
     and they completely disclosed for the government -- our
 4
 5
     experts have disclosed that, you know they responded to
 6
     that already, so --
 7
           THE COURT: So you understand, I'm not clear how
8
     this is going to play out. I know that I desire that it
9
     play out in open court, if I can comply with the
10
     appropriate law on the subject.
11
           All right, I've told you what my concerns are.
12
           Now I'm not trying to run away, I've got till
     2:30.
13
14
           Other matters?
15
           (Silence.)
           THE COURT: Very well. Good to see you all.
16
17
           9:00 tomorrow morning, opening statements, and
     we'll go right on.
18
           We'll recess.
19
           THE CLERK: All rise.
20
21
           (Ends, 2:15 p.m.)
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes before Judge William G. Young, on Monday, October 30, 2023, to the best of my skill and ability. /s/ Richard H. Romanow 10-30-23 RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date